



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/641,930	08/18/2000	Ramanujan K. Valmiki	37256/SAH/B600	7407

23363 7590 02/12/2003

CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP
350 WEST COLORADO BOULEVARD
SUITE 500
PASADENA, CA 91105

EXAMINER

SAJOUS, WESNER

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2676

DATE MAILED: 02/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

un

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/641,930

Applicant(s)

VALMIKI ET AL.

Examiner

Wesner Sajous

Art Unit

2676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 3-24 and 26-30 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3-4, 7. 6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to application serial number 09/641,930 filed on 08/18/2000. Claims 1-30 are presented for examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The Examiner acknowledges receipt of the information disclosure statements (IDS) filed on 4/6/01, 4/22/01, 8/26/02, 12/9/02, and on 1/31/03 of paper No. 4, 5, 7, and 12-13, respectively, under CFR 1.97. The references attached to the above dated information have been considered and signed copies are attached. However, those disclosure statements mailed on 9/3/02 and on 12/9/02 are missing. Additional copies of the missing PTO-1449 Forms are kindly solicited.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities: In the claim, the limitation including the clause "aligning the start of SLICES to...", in lines 3-4, appears to be vague and ambiguous, because it is unclear as to what "SLICES" the Applicants are referring to. In addition, the phrase "the start of SLICES" is uncalled for in the claim, because --the starting of SLICES-- has never been defined in the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 2676

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 25 recites the limitation "the step of aligning the start of each of the plurality of SLICES ..." in lines 3-4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim, because "***start of each of the plurality of SLICES***" has never been defined in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills et al., US Pat. No. 5923385, hereinafter Mills, in view of Abe et al. (Abe), Pat. No. 6134378.

Considering claim 1, Mills, at fig. 1, discloses a video transport processor comprising:

an input (20) for receiving one or more compressed data streams (*i.e.*, *MPEG-2 transport streams including compressed audio, video, and other data or elementary stream data, see col. 8, lines 48-56*); and means for extracting video data from the

Art Unit: 2676

compressed data streams (*is met by items 50 and 52 of fig. 1, see col. 9, lines 29-40, and col. 10, lines 24-25*).

It is noted that Mills fails to disclose the means for storing video data in an external memory and the means for generating a start code table to index the video data stored in the external memory.

Nonetheless, Abe, in a similar art, teaches the means (26, fig. 3) for storing video data in an external memory (35, fig. 3) and the means (61 and 62 of fig. 3) for generating a start code table (*i.e., time code management table of item 61 of fig. 3*) to index the video data (*i.e., the material information regarding recorded video data D60 or D61 for news program production broadcasting system 20*) stored in the external memory (35). See col. 17, lines 35-55.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Mills' system by incorporating together with the suggested means for storing video data in an external memory and the means for generating a start code table to index the video data stored in the external memory, as taught by Abe, because such a modification would provide the processing system of Mills the capability to easily set control information easily set without the operator's entering it and the editing processing based on the control information can be conducted, and thereby the Mills' video signal processing device having further improved operability can be realized. See Abe, col. 2, lines 58-67.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claim 2 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to overcome the Examiner's objection set forth in paragraph 3 above and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9. Claims 3-24, and 26-30 are allowed over the prior art.

Reasons For Allowance

The following is an Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance:

The present application has been thoroughly reviewed. Upon searching a variety of databases, the Examiner respectfully submits that the prior art of record (PTO-892) does not teach or suggest a transport processor system comprising, inter-alia, —a core transport processor for receiving a plurality of compressed data streams; a first and a second satellite transport processors for receiving at least one or more compressed data streams and for extracting video data and audio data, respectively, wherein the core transport processor provides data related to the compressed data streams to at least one of the first and the second satellite transport processors-- (as recited in independent claims 3 and 16); and a system comprising a satellite transport processor for receiving at least one of the compressed data streams received from the core transport processor and for extracting video data including a plurality of SLICEs; and MPEG-2 video decoder for blending the decoded video data with graphics, wherein the satellite transport processor generates a start code table to index the video data and

Art Unit: 2676

aligns the plurality of SLICEs to a suitable boundary— (as recited in independent claim 27).

10. Claim 25 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record, considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure, and are not relied upon herein, are as recited in the attached PTO-892 form.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Box

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, DC 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314, (for technology center 26000 only)

Or:

(703) 308-5359 for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED"

or DRAFT")

Hand-held delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, 6th floor (receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wesner Sajous whose telephone number is (703) 308-5857. The examiner can be reached on Mondays thru Thursdays and on alternate Fridays.

Application/Control Number: 09/641,930

Page 7

Art Unit: 2676

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Supervisor, Matthew Bella, can be reached at (703) 308-6829. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 308-6606.

Wesner Sajous -WS-


2/08/03